



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/676,270	09/28/2000	David Kammer	3197.ACCESS.ASA.	6725
49637	7590	07/11/2007		
BERRY & ASSOCIATES P.C. 9255 SUNSET BOULEVARD SUITE 810 LOS ANGELES, CA 90069			EXAMINER LY, NGHI H	
			ART UNIT 2617	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/11/2007	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/676,270

**Applicant(s)**

KAMMER, DAVID

**Examiner**

Nghii H. Ly

**Art Unit**

2617

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 April 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9 and 11-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,3-9 and 11-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                     | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Response to Arguments*

1. Applicant's arguments filed 04/19/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On pages 2-4 of Applicant's remarks, Applicant argues that that there is no suggestion to combine the references.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation to do so found in the references themselves in order to provide a system and method for saving and reusing name and address mappings (see Kephart, column 1, lines 6-9) and in order to provide a method and apparatus for prioritizing communication in a two-way communication system (see Lin, column 1, lines 6-10).

On page 5 of Applicant's remarks, Applicant argues that that Kephart is non-analogous art.

In response to applicant's argument that Kephart is nonanalogous art, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was

concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See *In re Oetiker*, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Kephart, the Applicant's admitted prior art and Lin teaches a two-way communication system, which are in the same field of applicant's endeavor

### **Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103**

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which the subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 3-9 and 11-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Applicant's admitted prior art in view of Kephart et al (US 6,026,445) and further in view of Lin et al (US 5,592,154).

Regarding claims 1, 9 and 18, the Applicant's admitted prior art teaches in an initiator device having a wireless transceiver (see BACK GROUND ART pages 1-7), a method for discovering a name of a responding device (see BACK GROUND ART pages 1-7) comprising: broadcasting a first wireless signal to be received by the responding device (see BACK GROUND ART pages 1-7), receiving a second wireless signal from the responding device (also see BACK GROUND ART pages 1-7), the second signal sent in response to the first signal and comprising an address for the responding device (also see BACK GROUND ART pages 1-7).

Art Unit: 2617

The Applicant's admitted prior art does not specifically disclose accessing a memory cache comprising names of devices, determining whether a name for the responding device is present in the memory cache, transmitting a request for a name to the responding device provided a name for the responding device is absent from the memory cache, receiving a name for the responding device in response to the request.

Kephart teaches the second signal sent in response to the first signal and comprising an address for the responding device (see Abstract, column 3, lines 44-60 and column 4, lines 26-39), accessing a memory cache comprising names of devices, determining whether a name for the responding device is present in the memory cache (see Abstract, column 3, lines 44-60 and column 4, lines 26-39), transmitting a request for a name to the responding device provided a name for the responding device is absent from the memory cache (also see Abstract, column 3, lines 44-60 and column 4, lines 26-39), receiving a name for the responding device in response to the request (also see Abstract, column 3, lines 44-60 and column 4, lines 26-39).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Kephart into the system of the Applicant's admitted prior art in order to provide a system and method for saving and reusing name and address mappings (see Kephart, column 1, lines 6-9).

The combination of the Applicant's admitted prior art and Kephart does not specifically disclose the name is indexed in the memory cache using the address for the responding device and wherein the name is retrievable from the memory cache using the address.

Art Unit: 2617

Lin teaches the name is indexed in the memory cache using the address for the responding device and wherein the name is retrievable from the memory cache using the address (see column 9, line 66 to column 10, line 4).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the teaching of Lin into the system of the Applicant's admitted prior art and Kephart in order to provide a method and apparatus for prioritizing communication in a two-way communication system (see Lin, column 1, lines 6-10).

Regarding claims 3 and 21, the combination of the Applicant's admitted prior art, Kephart and Lin further teaches removing from the memory cache an entry for one of the devices when a total number of cache entries exceeds a predetermined limit, the entry comprising a name and an address (see Kephart, column 2, lines 61-67 and column 4, lines 40-51).

Regarding claims 4 and 15, the combination of the Applicant's admitted prior art, Kephart and Lin further teaches an entry is removed from the memory cache according to an aging scheme, wherein the aging scheme ranks entries according to frequency of use (see Kephart, column 2, lines 61-67 and column 4, lines 40-51).

Regarding claims 5 and 12, the combination of the Applicant's admitted prior art, Kephart and Lin further teaches updating the memory cache when the name for the responding device is changed (see Kephart, column 2, lines 61-67 and column 4, lines 40-51).

Regarding claims 6, 11 and 20, the Applicant's admitted prior art further teaches displaying the name on a display of the initiator device (see BACK GROUND ART pages 4-5).

Regarding claims 7, 16 and 25, the combination of the Applicant's admitted prior art further teaches the initiator device and responding device are short-range-enabled devices (see BACK GROUND ART pages 1-7).

Regarding claims 8, 17 and 26, the Applicant's admitted prior art further teaches the initiator device is a portable computer system (see BACK GROUND ART pages 1-7).

Regarding claim 13, the combination of the Applicant's admitted prior art, Kephart and Lin further teaches storing in the memory cache an entry for each of a plurality of other responding devices, the entry comprising a name and an address (see Kephart, Abstract, column 3, lines 44-60 and column 4, lines 26-39).

Regarding claim 14, the combination of the Applicant's admitted prior art, Kephart and Lin further teaches removing from the memory cache an entry for one of the responding devices when a total number of cache entries exceeds a predetermined limit (see Kephart, column 2, lines 61-67 and column 4, lines 40-51).

Regarding claim 19, the combination of the Applicant's admitted prior art, Kephart and Lin further teaches broadcasting a second wireless signal to be received by the responding device (also see BACK GROUND ART pages 1-7), receiving the address from the responding device in response to the second wireless signal (also see BACK GROUND ART pages 1-7), and retrieving from the memory cache the name

Art Unit: 2617

corresponding to the address (see Kephart, column 2, lines 61-67 and column 4, lines 40-51).

Regarding claim 22, the combination of the Applicant's admitted prior art, Kephart and Lin further teaches storing in the memory cache an entry for each of a plurality of responding devices, the entry comprising a name and an address (see Kephart, column 2, lines 61-67 and column 4, lines 40-51).

Regarding claim 23, the combination of the Applicant's admitted prior art, Kephart and Lin further teaches removing from the memory cache an entry for one of the plurality of responding devices when a total number of cache entries exceeds a predetermined limit (see Kephart, column 2, lines 61-67 and column 4, lines 40-51).

Regarding claim 24, the combination of the Applicant's admitted prior art, Kephart and Lin further teaches an entry is removed from the memory cache according to an aging scheme, wherein the aging scheme ranks entries according to frequency of use (see Kephart, column 2, lines 61-67 and column 4, lines 40-51).

### ***Conclusion***

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the



Art Unit: 2617

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nghi H. Ly whose telephone number is (571) 272-7911. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 am-5:30 pm Monday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Appiah can be reached on (571) 272-7904. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nghi H. Ly

